

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being cancelled or added.

Claims 1, 13, 25 and 31 are currently being amended.

This amendment and reply amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-31 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101:

In the Office Action, claims 13-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as directed to non-statutory subject matter, since the specification is “currently not believed to enable the computer readable medium to act as a computer hardware component and realized its functionality absent being claimed in combination with the necessary hardware component to receive and convert the hardwired, wireless, or a combination of hardwired or wireless to computer useable code.” Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, based on the Examiner’s misunderstanding of paragraph 0018 of the specification.

Namely, paragraph 0018 of the specification states that “embodiments within the scope of the present invention include program products on computer-readable media and carriers for carrying or having computer-executable instructions or data structures stored thereon.” Thus, there exist one embodiment corresponding to program products on computer-readable media, another embodiment corresponding to carriers for carrying computer-executable instructions, yet another embodiment corresponding to data structures. This sentence in paragraph 0018 of the specification does not mean that an embodiment requires all of the features listed in that sentence, but rather a normal interpretation of this sentence is that an embodiment of the invention corresponds to computer-readable media, and only that. Therefore, the Examiner’s interpretation of paragraph 0018 of the specification is

incorrect, whereby the claimed computer readable-media does not require wireless or hardware components for enablement, and accordingly claims 13-24 fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-7, 10-19 and 22-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,920,870 to Briscoe et al.; and claims 8, 9, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Briscoe et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,382 to Bowman-Amuah. These rejections are traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

Presently pending independent claim 1 recites:

wherein the business level objects and the application level objects are respectively stored and displayed on a display as a plurality of nodes at different levels of abstraction, with correlations between the application level objects and the business level objects being accomplished by linking one or more nodes of the application level objects to one or more nodes of the business level objects at different levels of abstraction, and wherein the source data is linked to one or more of the plurality of nodes.

See, for example, the description on page 9 of the specification and Figures 1-3 of the drawings. Briscoe et al. describes a multi-layer abstraction bucket mechanism that connects application programs and at least one data source, whereby Briscoe et al. does not disclose or suggest the above-highlighted features of presently pending independent claim 1.

The Office Action asserts that Figures 1 and 2 of Briscoe teach linking one or more nodes of the application level objects to one or more nodes of the business level objects at different levels of abstraction. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The fact that Figure 1 of Briscoe shows patient services objects and Figure 2 shows database objects, does not mean that a user can link one or nodes of objects in Figure 1 with one or more objects of Figure 2. Rather, the user can merely link patient service objects in Figure 1 with each other, and the user can link database objects in Figure 2 with each other. No linking of patient service objects with database objects via a display can be performed in the system of Briscoe, and certainly no linking at different levels of abstraction via a display can be performed in the system of Briscoe.

Presently pending independent claim 1 has been amended to make it clear that the business level objects and the application level objects are respectively stored and displayed on a display as a plurality of nodes at different levels of abstraction, whereby Briscoe does not disclose or suggest such a capability.

Accordingly, presently pending independent claim 1, as well as presently pending independent claims 13, 25 and 31 that have been amended in a manner similar to the amendments made to claim 1, are not anticipated by Briscoe et al.

Furthermore, with respect to dependent claims 11 and 23, those claims recite:

wherein the step of displaying the stored data associated with both business level objects and the application level objects comprises:

displaying, on a first display screen, one or more of the business level objects as connected links; and

displaying, as connected links on a second display screen when one of the connected links on the first display screen is selected by a user, one or more of the application level objects that are correlated with the one or more of the business level objects.

Figures 1 and 2 of Briscoe and text in columns 4-10 of Briscoe fail to meet the specific features recited in dependent claims 11 and 23. The fact that a user can select a bucket, such as a Patient Bucket 40a as shown in Figure 2 of Briscoe, does not disclose or suggest that connected links are displayed on a second display screen when a user selects a connected link on a first display screen. Rather, no connected links are shown or suggested in Figure 1 of Briscoe, and in the discussion of that figure in the specification.

Accordingly, dependent claims 11 and 23 are not anticipated by Briscoe et al. for these additional reasons.

Still further, with respect to claims 12 and 24 (which depend from claims 11 and 23, respectively), those claims recite:

displaying, as connected links on a third display screen when one of the connected links on the second display screen is selected by a user, one or more of a lower level of application level objects that are correlated with the one or more of the application level objects displayed on the second display screen.

Briscoe et al. does not disclose or suggest such a third display screen of application level objects that provides a drill down from a second display screen of application level objects. The Office Action asserts that Figure 8 and column 16, lines 32-40 of Briscoe disclose these features, but this is incorrect. Namely, Figure 8A and 8B show abstraction layers, whereby this does not correspond to a display screen. Column 16, lines 32-40 of Briscoe describe that an abstraction layer may perform an application program operation on the data, but again this falls well short of the user selection and display features of claims 12 and 24.

Accordingly, dependent claims 12 and 24 are not anticipated by Briscoe et al. for these additional reasons.

It is also noted that Bowman-Amuah, which was applied against claims 8, 9, 20 and 21, does not rectify the above-mentioned deficiencies of Briscoe et al., and thus all of the presently pending claims are patentable over the combined teachings of those two references.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date February 21, 2007

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22879
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Phillip J. Articola

William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819